B & Two

App. F. IX-4

1927-28 (Law.)

File No. 59-27

Previous References
law 59-27, 1-5

P

Serial Nos. 6

Later References
Law 90-31-1-5
" 109-31-1-4

Preserved

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos. One

Part B for Sep 1929

SUBJECT

O.S. 19/27-28 (Venkata Ramana Rao V. Govt)

'D' Grade

W&W

1031/929
P 829

No 61.
Encl. 1.

SHIMOGA.

Dated 25th. August. 1929.

Law 59. 27-6

From

N. SESHA SASTRI, ESQ, B.A., B.L.,
Public Prosecutor,
SHIMOGA DIVISION.

To

The Secretary to Government,
Law Department, Bangalore.

Sir,

Re O.S. 19/27-28, District Judge's Court, Shimoga.
(Venkataramana Jois and others Vs Government)

I have the honor to forward herewith a true copy of the issues framed in the above case as required by Rule 97 of the Rules for the Conduct of Legal affairs of Government.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

N. Seshasastri

Public Prosecutor, Shimoga Division.

Submitted for perusal

TWO ANNAS

MYSORE

ಎರಡು ಆಣೆ

In The Court of The District Judge, Shimoga.

Original Suit No 19 of 27-28

Plaintiff :- Venkataramana Jois & others.

Defendant :- Government.

"Issues."

(1) Is The Relationship of Several plaintiffs inter se as alleged in the plaint true? are they etc. They all members of an undivided family?

(2) (a) Do the temple and the lands mentioned in the plaint and The Schedule belong to plaintiffs' family & under the gift alleged, — the lands having been gifted for The up-keep of the temple? and, (b) Has The Government con—

Copy applied for on the	Applicant told to appear on the	Applicant appeared on the	Copying stopped for want of copying sheets on the	Additional copying sheets supplied on the

Copy ready on the	Copy delivered on the	Copied by	Examined by

TWO ANNAS
ಎರಡು ಆಣೆ
MYSORE

2

conceded and recognised their right to the same from time to time or — Is the temple a "Public or a Mauzat institution under the "management of Government" endowed with the suit lands as are Inam?

(3) (a) Were the claims of plaintiffs' family to the suit properties duly considered at the time of Inam Settlement (1872), and was it then decided that the lands were Inam lands endowed to the temple? and,

(b) Are the plaintiffs entitled to get below that order? and (c) Has this Court the jurisdiction to entertain this suit?

Tm. 4h. 8

Copy applied for on the	Applicant told to appear on the	Applicant appeared on the	Copying stopped for want of copying sheets on the	Additional copying sheets supplied on the
31/7/25	14/8/25.	21/8/25		

Copy ready on the	Copy delivered on the	Copied by	Examined by
14/8/25	21/8/25	K. Bhowmick	

Sheets 27/8/25